



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

82u

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/932,385	08/17/2001	Guichao Hua	P/144-281	4420
2352	7590	07/30/2004	EXAMINER	
OSTROLENK FABER GERB & SOFFEN 1180 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK, NY 100368403			NGUYEN, MATTHEW VAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2838	

DATE MAILED: 07/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/932,385

Applicant(s)

HUA ET AL.

Examiner

MATTHEW V NGUYEN

Art Unit

2838

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 June 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

1. Applicant's Amendment filed on April 26, 2004 has been entered and carefully considered. Claim 17 has been canceled. Claims 1-10 are in condition of allowance. However, arguments regarding the rejections 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 35 U.S. C. 103(a) to claims 11-16 have not been found to be persuasive. Therefore, claims 11-16 are rejected under the same ground of rejection as set forth in the Office Action mailed on August 12, 2003.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 11, 12, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Seong (U.S. Pat. No. 5,771,160) or Zak (U.S. Pat. No. 5,619,404).

With regard to claims 11, 12, 15 and 16, either Seong (i.e., Fig. 1) or Zak (i.e., Fig. 2) shows a multiple output adapter circuit comprising all the claimed subject matter such as a single output converter circuit (10 in both Seong and Zak) having a full-wave bridge rectifier for converting an ac supply voltage into a single dc voltage, a dc-dc converter circuit (20-40 in Seong; 12 in Zak) connected thereto and converting the single dc voltage into multiple output dc voltages.

Applicant has argued that in both of Seong and Zak, the AC voltage is converted into an intermediate DC voltage that is not an output voltage. It is not quite true, because there is no such a statement in either of Seong or Zak. In fact, the DC voltage that is rectified from the AC input voltage through the bridge rectifier in Seong or Zak can be used as a DC output voltage. Moreover and again, the circuit in Seong (Fig. 1)

or Zak (Fig. 2) comprises all the limitations in claims 11, 12, 15 and 16 as discussed above, thus claims 11, 12, 15 and 16 are anticipated by either Seong or Zak.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seong or Zak in view of Hua (U.S. Pat. No. 6,118,673).

With regard to claim 13, either Seong or Zak shows a multiple output adapter circuit comprising all the claimed subject matter as discussed above, except for the rectifier circuit being a single diode. Hua (Fig. 1) shows a power converter circuit in which the rectifier circuit DR is a single diode. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the full-wave bridge rectifier in Seong or Zak with a single diode as disclosed in Hua for the purpose of simplifying the circuit as reducing the number of diodes.

Applicant has argued that Hua does not cure any deficiencies of Seong and Zak and claim 13 is dependent from claim 11, therefore claim 13 is patentable. However, either Seong or Zak discloses all the claimed subject matter in claim 11 as discussed, and there is no specific argument why the combination of Seong or Zak to Hua is non-workable, along with the motivation as stated above, claim 13 is unpatentable over Seong or Zak in view of Hua.

4. Claims 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seong or Zak in view of Itoh et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,519,306).

With regard to claim 14, either Seong or Zak shows a multiple output adapter circuit comprising all the claimed subject matter as discussed above, except for the rectifier circuit being a half-wave rectifier. Itoh et al. (Fig. 6) shows a power converter circuit in which the rectifier circuit 21 is a half-wave rectifier. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the full-wave bridge rectifier in Seong or Zak with a half-wave rectifier as disclosed in Itoh et al. for the purpose of simplifying the circuit as reducing the number of diodes.

Applicant has argued that Itoh et al. does not cure any deficiencies of Seong and Zak and claim 14 is dependent from claim 11, therefore claim 14 is patentable. However, either Seong or Zak discloses all the claimed subject matter in claim 11 as discussed, and there is no specific argument why the combination of Seong or Zak to Itoh et al. is non-workable, along with the motivation as stated above, claim 14 is unpatentable over Seong or Zak in view of Itoh et al.

5. Claims 1-10 are allowable over prior art.

None of prior art of record taken alone or in combination shows first and second housings remotely located in which the first housing encloses the single power converter circuit, and the second housing encloses the dc-dc converter circuit.

6. This is a Request for Continued Examination of applicant's earlier Application No. 09/932,385. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the

next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew V. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-2081.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2800.

*Matthew V. Nguyen*  
**MATTHEW V. NGUYEN**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**